

From: [Jennings, Kim](#)
To: [Jennings, Kim](#); [Deitz, Randy](#)
Cc: [Tulis, Dana](#); [Stanton, Larry](#); [Kohn, Jeffrey](#)
Subject: RE: Issues for Hearing
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 3:01:11 PM

Hi Randy,

Here is the section from the 6a document that Mathy was referring to in the meeting today: While EPA believes the EPCRA and RMP regulation made important progress in preventing and mitigating chemical accidents in the United States and protecting communities from chemical hazards, more needs to be done reviewing and evaluating current program and practices, and applying lessons learned to continuously advance chemical safety and risk management. For that reason, EPA is seeking public input on potential areas to improve the RMP program and further reduce the number of chemical accidents within the United States. There are several categories of items within this document where potential options have been developed based on information gathered during listening sessions, input from stakeholders, and experiences from implementing the program. Categories to consider include:

[REDACTED]

Let me know if you have any questions.

Kim

From: Jennings, Kim
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 11:20 AM
To: Deitz, Randy
Cc: Tulis, Dana; Stanton, Larry; Kohn, Jeffrey
Subject: RE: Issues for Hearing

Randy,

Here are the documents I promised at the meeting.

I will work on the WV paragraph after the Administrator's meeting as well as pulling out the appropriate sections of the 6a document.

Thanks,

Kim

From: Deitz, Randy

Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 11:15 AM
To: Tulis, Dana
Cc: Jennings, Kim
Subject: RE: Issues for Hearing

[REDACTED]

From: Tulis, Dana
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 10:02 AM
To: Deitz, Randy
Subject: Re: Issues for Hearing
[Got it, we can't answer these right off, you know, will need some time.](#)

From: Deitz, Randy
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 9:57:35 AM
To: Tulis, Dana
Subject: Issues for Hearing

Dana, I came up with an issues list for the hearing that I plan to hand out this morning. I wanted you to have it (see below).

ISSUES –

[REDACTED]

WV Chemical spill – What is status? Why was this facility not regulated by EPA? Is this a gap in federal regulatory framework? If yes, how should the gap be closed? Do you support the Boxer, Manchin, Rockefeller bill to regulate chemical facilities to protect drinking water resources? If not, what changes should be made to the bill? Will you use your authority under CWA section 311 to regulate hazardous substances discharged into Waters of the U.S and adjoining shorelines?

CCR Rule and CCR Facility Assessments – Status of rule? What follow up to assessments is being done at high CCR hazard facilities? Will you commit to following up at these high hazard facilities?

Duke Dan River Facility CCR Spill – What is status? Did you assess this facility? What was the finding? Has there been follow up to ensure that the facility addressed the deficiencies identified in the assessment? Will you commit to following up at this facility?